



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/938,944

08/24/2001

Trung M. Tran

5181-82200

2680

58467

7590

03/28/2008

MHKKG/SUN

P.O. BOX 398

AUSTIN, TX 78767

EXAMINER

SHAW, PELING ANDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2144

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/938,944
Filing Date: August 24, 2001
Appellant(s): TRAN, TRUNG M.

Noel Kivlin
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 01/15/2008 appealing from the Office Action mailed on 03/08/2007 and Advisory Action mailed on 07/23/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal in the brief is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 6675261 B2	Shandony	01-2004
US 6049799 A	Mangat et al.	04-2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shandony (US 6675261 B2), hereinafter referred as Shandony, and further in view of Mangat et al. (US 6049799 A), hereinafter referred as Mangat.

- a. Shandony shows (claim 1) a method comprising: populating a directory with entries for each of a plurality of users of a multi-user computing environment, wherein each entry in the directory comprises a user ID and one or more group names, wherein each of the one or more group names corresponds to a group to which the user ID belongs, and wherein at least one of the entries in the directory comprises a first group name of the one or more group names (Fig. 1, 5, 7-12: Emp1, Org A, Org B, Org C, Org D, Uid, Create Group, My Groups, entity, domain; column 7, line 64-column 8, line 12: Group Manager 44 allows entities to create, delete and manage groups of users who need identical access privileges to a specific resource or set of resources. Managing and controlling privileges for a group of related people); determining a first group access control list for the first group name, wherein the first group access control list comprises the user IDs of users whose directory entries comprise the first group name (column 7, lines 64-column 8, 29: access privileges for a group of users on resources); for each data source in the multi-user computing environment which permits access by the first group name, granting access to the respective data source to the users in the first group access control list (Fig. 7-12; column 7, line 64-column 8, line 12: Group Manager 44 allows entities to create, delete and manage groups of users who need

identical access privileges to a specific resource or set of resources. Managing and controlling privileges for a group of related people). Shandony does not show explicitly (claim 1) wherein the first group access control list is stored outside of the directory.

- b. Mangat shows (claim 1) wherein the first group access control list is stored outside of the directory (Fig. 4 and 5, column 2, lines 14-28: new type of directory services object that may be used to provide document management of documents accessed by users, groups of users; column 12, line 23-33: user object and group object are separate: column 15, line 10-43: user object; column 16, line 13-21: group object; user object and group object are quite different in their functions) in an analogous art for the purpose of document link management using directory services.
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Shandony's functions of request based caching of data store data with Mangat's function of document link management.
- d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have group access functions different from user access functions per Mangat and Shandony's teaching.
- e. Regarding claim 2, Shandony shows wherein each entry in the directory comprises a user password; and wherein the method further comprises authenticating each user ID using the associated user password (column 9, lines 10-43).

- f. Regarding claim 3, Shandony shows wherein each entry in the directory comprises zero, one, or a plurality of hostnames (Fig. 1 and 3); wherein the directory comprises a first hostname; and wherein the method further comprises: for each data source in the multi-user computing environment which permits access by the first hostname, granting access to the data source to the one or more users whose directory entries comprise the first hostname and who are seeking access from the host having the first hostname (Fig. 1, 5 and 69; column 6, lines 52-57: The Access System includes Access Server 34, Web Gate 28, and Directory Server 36. Access Server 34 provides authentication, authorization, auditing logging services. It further provides for identity profiles to be used across multiple domains and Web Servers from a single web-based authentication (sign-on); column 71, line 47-column 72, line 12: checking POST from Web Gate for access verification).
- g. Regarding claim 4, Shandony shows wherein the data source comprises a file or a directory in a file system coupled to the multi-user computing environment (Fig. 1, 3 and 8-15).
- h. Regarding claim 5, Shandony shows wherein the access comprises read access; and wherein the granting access to the data source to the users in the first group access control list comprises permitting the users in the first group access control list to read the data source (column 13, lines 25-27).
- i. Regarding claim 6, Shandony shows wherein the access comprises write access; and wherein the granting access to the data source to the users in the first group

access control list comprises permitting the users in the first group access control list to write to the data source (column 13, lines 27-33).

- j. Regarding claim 7, Shandony shows wherein the access comprises execute access; and wherein the granting access to the data source to the users in the first group access control list comprises permitting the users in the first group access control list to execute the data source (column 13, lines 40-53).
- k. Regarding claim 8, Shandony shows for each data source in the multi-user computing environment which permits access by the first group name and owner but denies access to others, denying access to the data source to users who are not in the first group access control list and who are not the owner of the data source (column 7, lines 54-column 8, line 11; column 71, line 47-column 72, line 12: checking POST from Web Gate for access verification).
- l. Regarding claim 9, Shandony shows wherein the multi-user computing environment comprises a UNIX based operating system (column 11, lines 5-6).
- m. Claim 10-16 is of the same scope as claims 1-7 and 9. These are rejected for the same reasons as for claims 1-7 and 9.
- n. Claims 17-25 are of the same scope as claims 1-9. These are rejected for the same reasons as for claims 1-9.

Together Shandony and Mangat disclosed all limitations of claims 1-25. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

(10) Response to Argument

In response to Appellant's argument that Shandony and Mangat, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest that a first group access control list (comprising the user IDs of users whose entries comprise the first group name) is stored outside of the directory, in combination with the remaining features of claim 1 (see paragraphs starting 2nd to last on page 5 of current appeal brief filed):

1. As per item a of the Response to Arguments in office action dated 01/27/2006:

The applicant has claimed "the determining a first group access control list ..." with the references to Fig. 5, 127, Fig. 6, 603, page 3, line 24-page 4, line 2, page 12, lines 23-28, and page 13, lines 22-29. The cited references narrate the intended functions and possible contents of access control list. The cited references do not provide detail description of how to determine. The claim is thus interpreted to have access control list based on the directory entries.

As the applicant points out (Fig. 5), the directory server (113) and access control list (127) are in the same computer system (100). The applicant has also pointed out (page 10, lines 5-7) a file system (111) contains files, directories and any other suitable form of information.

2. As per claim 1 rejection in item 1.a of section 9 above, Shandony has shown in Fig. 1, 5, 7-12 Emp1, Org A, Org B, Org C, Org D, Uid, Create Group, My Groups, entity and domain; (column 7, line 64-column 8, line 12) Group Manager 44 allows entities to create, delete and manage groups of users who need identical access privileges to a specific resource or set of resources, i.e. manage and control privileges for a group of related people. As further in column 8, lines 12-29 of Shandony, with group manager,

companies (or other entities) can allow individuals to self-subscribe to, unsubscribe from, view and request subscription to groups that have access to applications they need. Thus Shandony has shown as per claim 1 rejection the limitation of populating a directory with entries for each of plurality of users of a multi-user computing environment and determining a first group access control list for the first group name. As per claim 1 rejection, Shandony does not seem to show explicitly wherein the first group access control list is stored outside of the directory. This is actually not quite true. As the directory per claim 1 language is per user. Shandony has shown (column 6, line 64-column 7, lines 19) that an identity profile is a set of information associated with a particular entity, e.g. user, group and organization; and User Manger manages identity profile for individual users; group managers manages identity profiles for groups. It seems that profiles for users are separated from profiles for groups as per Shandony. Shandony has also shown (column 36, lines 54-65) an identify profile for a group includes an attribute that stores a list of all static member; (column 38, lines 22-42) a membership list is kept and updated for groups; (column 38, line 66-column 39, line 6) an entity, e.g. user, accesses and requests to see the members of the group or the expanded list of members. Thus it seems clear that Shandony alone may have the limitation of “wherein the first group access control list is stored outside of the directory”.

3. As Mangat was originally brought in to show the limitation of “wherein the first group access control list is stored outside of the directory”. The recited reference (Fig. 4 and 5, column 2, lines 14-28: new type of directory services object that may be used to

provide document management of documents accessed by users, groups of user, e.g.

Docloc objects; column 12, line 23-33: user object and group object are separate: column 15, line 10-43: user object; column 16, line 13-21: group object; user object and group object are quite different in their functions) seem to further clearly identify the separation of user object from group object wherein the group object contains a membership list.

Magnat clearly teaches a “Docloc table” (a form of list) stored outside a directory system, said table pointed to by Docloc object to store information (column 2, lines 14-28).

In response to Appellant’s argument of Shandony not teaching or suggesting “granting access to the data source to the one or more users whose directory entries comprise the first hostname and who are seeking access from the host having the first hostname” (see paragraphs starting last on page 5 of current appeal brief filed):

1. Appellant has states that Shandony disclose a policy URL obtain from a diretory entry including a hostname (see paragraphs starting last on page 5 of current appeal brief filed). As per claim 3 rejection in item 1.f of section 9 above, Shandony has shown that (Fig. 1, 5 and 69; column 6, lines 52-57) the Access System includes Access Server 34, Web Gate 28, and Directory Server 36; Access Server 34 provides authentication, authorization, auditing logging services; It further provides for identity profiles to be used across multiple domains and Web Servers from a single web-based authentication (sign-on) and (column 71, line 47-column 72, line 12) checking POST from Web Gate for access verification). As further per the response to argument in Advisory Action dated 07/23/2007, Shandony has shown (Fig. 5 and column 14, line 47-column 15, line 17) an

Art Unit: 2100

user can access the Identity System services using a browser providing login page for authentication/authorization to applications.

(11) *Related Proceeding(s) Appendix*

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Peling A Shaw

/P. A. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 2144

March 24, 2008

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

Conferees:

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151